

## **APPENDIX G: Citizen Oversight, Community & Stakeholder Input**

### **A. Input During Development Phase**

Throughout Fall, 2000 and Spring, 2001, input was sought from a variety of key stakeholders, including service providers, other funders, human service planners and other aging service stakeholders to guide the development of the revised King County Aging Services Funding Policy. In particular, input was sought regarding the needs of seniors throughout King County, types of services actually provided, barriers to receiving or accessing services, as well as King County's role in the aging network. County staff received input via survey tools, interviews, and participation in meetings of stakeholders such as the Children and Family Commission and the Regional Planners Forum.

In addition to collecting new information regarding aging services, County staff also revisited the results of the King County Community Services Division Strategic Plan which highlighted issues from seven sub-regions of King County. This data was collected via phone surveys with statistically valid samples of residents from all of the sub-regions. Due to the thoroughness and extensive nature of this data collection effort, the results were considered to still be relevant and as such were utilized in the development of the revised funding policy.

Specific input sought from stakeholders included:

*Citizen Oversight - Children & Family Commission* -- Per their role providing oversight and review of the Human Services Recommendation Report and identified recommendations, County staff presented the Children & Family Commission with an overview of the proposed approach to the development of the revised funding policy. In addition, staff provided the members of the commission with a briefing on the history of the King County Aging Program and existing 1989 Aging Funding Policy. Input was received from the Commissioners regarding the proposed approach as well as suggestions for additional stakeholder input.

*King County Interdepartmental Human Services Team (IHST)* -- The Interdepartmental Human Services Team participated throughout the development of the Aging Services Funding Policy. County staff provided IHST with regular briefings on all aspects of the process, including the intended approach, findings, and draft policy. IHST provided input and suggestions related to the focus and direction of the aging program service area review.

*Cities* -- County staff conducted interviews with personnel from eight cities, including Bothell, Woodinville, Shoreline, Carnation, Issaquah, Renton, Enumclaw, and Auburn. Information was gathered through interview questions concerning the needs of seniors, current services and funding provided by each city and recipients of services and funding. In addition, input was sought regarding the existing funding role of each city as well as the role of King County in the aging network.

**What would you consider to be the areas of most unmet need for seniors in your city and/or King County?**

- ◆ Renton -- Transportation, non-english speaking seniors.
- ◆ Enumclaw -- Dental health, mental health, public transportation.
- ◆ Bothell -- Basic socialization needs; community activities; transportation services, day care services, and in-home personal care.
- ◆ Shoreline -- Adult day health is underserved and in jeopardy; there are not enough hours available for respite care and medical. This is needed to take pressure off the seniors usual care providers e.g., family. Growing need for ethnic focused care. The Hispanic and Asian populations are growing and the services designed for them need to grow as well.
- ◆ Carnation -- Healthcare and transportation.
- ◆ Woodinville -- Tax increases from increased assessments makes housing less affordable, transportation.
- ◆ Auburn -- Stable affordable housing (upkeep, utilities, repairs), transportation.
- ◆ Issaquah -- Affordable housing, public transportation.

**What, if any, significant barriers exist that hinder senior's access to specific senior services?**

- ◆ Enumclaw -- Transportation for rural areas.
- ◆ Renton -- Housing repair services, transportation, language.
- ◆ Bothell -- Inadequate size and number of senior oriented facilities as existing facilities experiencing overuse; lack of transportation, inadequate housing choices for seniors in various states of life.
- ◆ Shoreline -- Lack of transportation, cultural barriers. Senior services are not currently multicultural or multilingual.
- ◆ Carnation: Current lack of transportation.
- ◆ Woodinville: NA
- ◆ Auburn -- Transportation, language barriers.
- ◆ Issaquah -- Funding, transportation, physical structure of senior center.

**What role do you think King County should play in aging services?**

- ◆ Renton -- Have aging services involved in regular subregional planning efforts, participate in the development of grants for seniors, support efforts to get additional revenue together.
- ◆ Issaquah -- Ensure that every citizen has equal opportunity to receive services.
- ◆ Enumclaw -- Support communities that are serving unincorporated residents.
- ◆ Bothell -- Continue to support senior center and adult day center services, especially in Northshore, since they serve a number of unincorporated residents each year.
- ◆ Shoreline -- King County should play a limited role as a funder of senior centers
- ◆ Carnation -- No changes
- ◆ Woodinville -- Does well at regional needs assessments; deal with everything equally.
- ◆ Auburn -- Need to get out of the local role and more into a regional role.

*Service Providers* -- In addition to collecting information informally from providers throughout the development of the revised funding policy, County staff also developed and distributed surveys to all service providers receiving funding from King County in year 2001. Surveys were sent to 27 agencies, 21 were returned. Information covered in the survey included an agency/program services chart, geographic areas served, availability and access to services within the program service area, effectiveness of agency services, and King County's role in the aging network.

**What services are most difficult to access for seniors and their caregivers living within the geographic area you serve?**

Adult day services(2); in-home care workers (7); transportation (14), health services (4), respite for caregivers (6); dental care; mental health services; culturally appropriate services for new immigrants, shopping & chore services (4); emergency funding for basic needs (2); prescriptions; emergency housing; low income/affordable housing (4); home repair (2); medical insurance

**Why is it difficult to get these services?**

Lack of transportation	13
Services are unavailable	12
Services are too expensive	6
Seniors do not have sufficient information	5
Other – eligibility criteria makes it difficult for people to qualify	6

**What is the most effective role King County could play in the overall system of senior services?**

Supporting services for frail vulnerable elders to remain living with their families or in the community and out of institutions (9); fund community based services that support caregivers who are caring for elders on their own; supporting small cities; assist with collaborative events; be a voice for senior services; continued/additional funding (10); monitoring progress of program effectiveness; help publicize programs; provide more transportation and access to health and wellness providers; advocacy for greater accessibility to community based long term support services as well as increased funding (3)

*Regional Planners* -- As a mechanism for gathering information for the Regional Planners Forum, which took place in May, 2001, a pre-questionnaire was developed by City of Seattle Aging and Disability Services. County staff were provided with the opportunity to submit questions to be included in the questionnaire regarding aging services and King County's role. Twelve responses were received from planners representing a variety of subregions.

Results from the questionnaire include:

Subregions represented: Seattle (3), South Urban/South Rural (2), East Urban/East Rural (4), Entire County (3)

**Identify the three most pressing needs for seniors and adults with disabilities:**

Accessible/affordable health services, affordable housing, transportation; others – Adult Day Health Care in Auburn and Federal Way; access to resources; chore services

**King County's role should be:** coordination of funding and planning, including rural areas  
Role with other partners – coordination and sharing of information, planning and services; a continuum of services for seniors and adults with disabilities; support services that cities cannot

fund; work with all jurisdictions to work for a robust and stable source of revenue for human services; work to improve transportation; fund information and assistance for Latino elders.

## **B. Input on Draft Aging Services Funding Policy**

*Public Input Forums* -- The King County Department of Community and Human Service, Community Services Division provided two opportunities for public input on the draft 2001 Aging Services Funding Policy. Approximately 400 recipients received notices regarding the public input forums, along with the draft policy and documentation regarding the development of recommendations sent via U.S. mail and e-mail.

Two King County Aging Program Funding Policy Public Input Forums were held in early June:

- Seattle -- Monday, June 4, 2001. Tallmadge Hamilton House, University Activity Center, Seattle
- Renton – Tuesday, June 5, 2001. Good Neighbor Center, Renton.

A total of 25 participants attended the two public forums to provide formal public comment. Four individuals also provided written comment.

Participants at the public forums included service provider staff, agency board members, senior center participants, senior center volunteers, and city personnel. The following programs, agencies, and cities were represented at the forums:

Black Diamond Community Center  
City of Issaquah  
City of Kent Human Services  
City of Pacific  
City of Shoreline  
Eastside Adult Day Services  
Elderhealth - Elderfriends  
Evergreen Club Korean Seniors  
Federal Way Senior Center  
Fremont Public Association  
Highline Senior Center  
Maple Valley Community Center  
Mt. Si Senior Center  
Northshore Senior Center  
Senior Rights Assistance  
Senior Services  
Visiting Nurse Services

The following is a summary of themes that emerged through the public input process:

### **Concerns about the role of King County –**

Throughout the public input process, a number of stakeholders expressed concern that much of the policy referred only to unincorporated residents and left out incorporated residents of both small and large cities. Questions were asked about the County's role as a sponsor in the Area Agency on Aging and whether or not that role included advocacy for the balance of county and not just unincorporated residents. Many stakeholders encouraged King County to increase their advocacy role to ensure that regional and mandated services are provided for all the residents of King County.

In addition, several stakeholders brought up issues related to the ability of incorporated cities to fill human services gaps, especially when they had previously received county funding. Specific questions were asked about how King County prepared cities for and handled funding transitions when county funding was either decreased or eliminated per the existing funding policy.

#### **Role of Area Agency on Aging (AAA) -**

A number of questions were asked about how the Area Agency on Aging determined funding priorities and distributed funds for services throughout King County. In particular, participants requested that an analysis of where Area Agency on Aging funds were currently being directed be undertaken by the sponsors of AAA. There was general concern that suburban and rural cities were not equitably receiving funds for mandated services as distributed by AAA.

Other comments and questions were raised regarding the sponsors of AAA and who had specific responsibilities for advocating for the needs of cities and unincorporated areas outside of Seattle. It was explained that all of the sponsors share the responsibility of ensuring that funds are directed appropriately. Suggestions were provided regarding opening up the "sponsors" membership to include other jurisdictions. If this was not possible, recommendations were made regarding increased advocacy for a strong representation of the needs of municipalities, as well as unincorporated areas, to the AAA.

#### **Policy criteria -**

For the most part, there was not a great deal of concern expressed regarding the proposed service criteria which agencies must meet in order to continue funding. Criteria include the number of unincorporated residents served, location of service in relation to unincorporated areas, and requested funding by other jurisdictions for those programs located in cities over 12,000. Requests were made that the County follow through with their intention to include agencies and programs in the development of future targets regarding the number of unincorporated residents served. In addition, technical assistance was requested for the actual collection of demographic data, specifically related to whether or not a participant resides in an unincorporated area. Finally, it was requested that when determining future unincorporated resident targets, that the overall numbers served by the agency be taken into consideration, since this might penalize agencies that serve a high number of participants, both incorporated and unincorporated.

#### **Definitions of particular services as mandated, regional, or local -**

Several service providers requested clarification as to how various services were defined as either mandated, regional, or local services. In particular this issue was raised for both advocacy services as well as nutrition services. Concerns were raised that as a result of the Meals as Wheels being defined as a regional responsibility versus a local service, it would not be funded with King County CX funds. This categorization could have a negative impact on the frail elderly who would no longer be able to receive this service. In addition, stakeholders requested clarification in the

meetings as to how the County determined what would be included or considered as "core services" for the aging program, and thus would be given priority in terms of the Aging Services Funding Policy. There was concern expressed by several stakeholders that what was being included as core services was not broad enough to adequately meet the needs of the aging population.

*Citizen Oversight - Children and Family Commission* -- County staff attended the June 11, 2001 Children and Family Commission meeting to present the proposed Aging Services Funding Policy ordinance and findings from the funding policy development process. In addition, the presentation highlighted changes between the current 1989 policy and the revised policy. No specific revisions to the policy were requested. In general, some of the same issues identified in the public input forums were also raised by the Commission, especially in regards to the role of the County regarding both unincorporated and incorporated residents of King County. There was similar sentiment regarding the need for King County to be a strong advocate, with the Area Agency on Aging and other jurisdictions to ensure that all seniors, regardless of residence, receive necessary services.